

## LA-UR-15-21953

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Title: Pirbhai, Tupa, and Gay respond to Williams, et al.

Author(s): Gay, Timothy J  
Tupa, Dale

Intended for: Physical Review A

Issued: 2015-03-17

---

**Disclaimer:**

Los Alamos National Laboratory, an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer, is operated by the Los Alamos National Security, LLC for the National Nuclear Security Administration of the U.S. Department of Energy under contract DE-AC52-06NA25396. By approving this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution, or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes. Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy. Los Alamos National Laboratory strongly supports academic freedom and a researcher's right to publish; as an institution, however, the Laboratory does not endorse the viewpoint of a publication or guarantee its technical correctness.

Pirbhai, Tupa, and Gay respond.

In the preceding Comment [1] on our recent report of a Rb spin-exchange polarized electron source [2], Williams *et al.* contend (a) that our source is primitive and poorly characterized compared with modern GaAs sources, (b) that we have “overstated” the difficulties of using GaAs photoemission sources, and (c) that our explanation of various physics issues related to the source’s operating principles are not “cogent.” We consider these issues in turn.

We concur that our source is primitive and not completely characterized. This was also true of the GaAs source after the seminal report on it by Pierce and Meier [3] immediately following its invention. That our source has many opportunities for improvement is not a drawback; the multiple, independent paths for improvement and better characterization of the spin-exchange source are straightforward and will reveal a great deal of interesting source physics. The authors of the Comment thank the “many visiting researchers for their assistance in characterizing and improving [their] GaAs polarized electron sources and experiments.” We too look forward to when the spin-exchange source is a mature laboratory tool rather than the result of one graduate student’s thesis work. In any event, it is not reasonable to withhold a report on a viable, new, interesting technology until every bug has been eliminated and a final, engineered product is ready for commercialization.

Despite several editorial rounds with our feedback before publication of their Comment, Williams *et al.* continue to take our statement that GaAs sources [can be] “unuseable or, at best, highly problematic” out of context; the full sentence in our report is: “In tabletop experiments with vapor targets, such as ours, destruction of the photocathode’s NEA surface conditions by organic and other vacuum contaminants can make GaAs sources unusable or, at best, highly problematic.” We were referring to the use of GaAs photocathodes in environments with heated vapor targets of organic halocamphors that have aggressively shortened the lifetime of our photocathode activations. Despite their assertion, Williams *et al.* offer no evidence from their own laboratory to the contrary. The experiments they cite from Perth involved targets of ultraclean UHV surfaces, noble gases, and Zn vapor. These are much more benign targets than the ones to which we specifically referred. We have used GaAs sources in the same types of experiments done by Williams’ group. In these cases, we too found the GaAs source to be reliable and relatively easy to use – once a student had learned over the course of many months how to make it work properly. At one point, we ran uninterrupted with such a source for the better part of a year.

We disagree (as apparently would the referees of our original paper) that our discussion of the physics in the optical pumping and spin-exchange processes on which our source relies lacks cogency. We have not done enough experiments yet to fully understand the fine details of the polarization mechanisms in our source, and were quite careful to note when our explanations should be characterized as plausible but speculative due to our current lack of experience with the source.

Finally, we respond to a few specific points made in the above Comment. In a short Communication, there is not enough space to address any but the most relevant and/or novel details. The laser beam tuning for frequency, power, and polarization and the subsequent electron beam characteristics were quite stable. The Comment's references to radiation trapping and magnetic field variations do not counter our straightforward measurements of Rb and electron polarizations under various source operating conditions. Our paper only makes claims about electron thermalization by the buffer gas (not the thermalization of a "gas mixture"), and we provide references for the mechanisms we propose.

Williams *et al.* mention that GaAs sources are commercially available. They are only sold as part of a system that costs ~\$1.45M Australian dollars, for use in pristine UHV environments involving surface experiments, and are no easier to use than the GaAs sources we have been using in our group since 1987 (which are similar to those used by William's group in Perth since the early 1990s). We have operated both spin-exchange and GaAs sources and are confident that our optically-pumped spin-exchange source can serve a real need in university research laboratories. The fact remains that a simple, reliable, user-friendly polarized electron source would significantly broaden the possibilities for polarized electron research in many laboratories.

[1] J.F.Williams, S.Samarin, and L. Pravica, the above Comment.

[2] M. Pirbhai, J. Knepper, E.T.Litaker, D. Tupa, and T.J.Gay, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 060701(R) (2013).

[3] F.Meier and D.T.Pierce, Phys. Rev. B **13**, 5484 (1976).